APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,068	05/02/2006	Maarten Peter Bodlaender	NL 031314	5014

24737   7590   09/15/2009
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER
TRAN, PHILIP B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2455	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/15/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _02 May 2006_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-31_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-31_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)
1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1.   Claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 17, 21 and 26-29 are objected to because of the following

informalities: All items in parentheses should have been deleted from above claims.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Stephens et al (Hereafter, Stephens), U.S. Pat. No. 7,170,857.

Regarding claim 1, Stephens teaches method of enabling differentiated control

point access to services provided by a media provision entity in a computing

environment (10) having a computer networking connectivity model (i.e., an access

point and a controller configured to mediate transmissions between the wireless device

and other devices) [see Abstract and Fig. 1], comprising the steps of : providing at least

one logical device (24, 26) for a media provision entity (12),(step 38), and providing at

least two different sets of permissions in relation to assets (asset1, asset2, asset3,

asset4, asset5, asset6) associated with the media provision entity from said logical

device, (step 40) [see Figs. 1 & 11 and Col. 4, Line 4 to Col. 5, Line 58].

Regarding claim 2, Stephens further teaches method according to claim 1,

wherein the sets provide different permissions on an asset-by-asset basis [see Col. 12,

Lines 1-11].

Regarding claim 3, Stephens further teaches method according to claim 1,

wherein at least two logical devices are provided and a separate set of permissions is

provided for each device [see Fig. 1 and Abstract].

Regarding claim 4, Stephens further teaches method according to claim 1,

wherein at least two different sets allow at least one and the same action on an asset,

but provide different results [see Col. 12, Lines 1-30].

Regarding claim 5, Stephens further teaches method according to claim 1,

wherein the step of providing different sets of permissions is provided via a content

directory service provided in each logical device [see Figs. 1 & 14].

Regarding claim 6, Stephens further teaches method according to claim 1, further comprising the steps of registering a control point (20) with a security console (22) associated with the media provision entity (12), (step 42), and providing the control point with access according to at least one (24, 26) of the sets of permission [see Fig. 1 and Col. 3, Lines 32-49 and Col. 12, Lines 1-30].

Regarding claim 7, Stephens further teaches method according to claim 6, wherein the control point is provided with access according to only one of the sets of permission [see Abstract and Col. 12, Lines 1-30].

Regarding claim 8, Stephens further teaches method according to claim 6, wherein there are at least two logical devices provided and a separate set of permissions is provided for each device and further comprising the step of attempting accessing all devices from the control point, (step 46), allowing access from one of the devices according to the set of permissions of that device, (step 48), and returning a fail message to the control point from the other devices, (step 50) [see Figs. 1 & 11].

Regarding claims 9-11, Stephens further teaches method according to claim 6, wherein the control point is provided with access to both the sets of permission and further comprising the step of only allowing access for the set of permissions that are the most extensive and further comprising the step of allowing access based on a

logical "or" or "exclusive-or" operation of the sets of permissions [see Col. 12, Lines 1-30 and Col. 13, Lines 53-62].

Regarding claim 12, Stephens further teaches method according to claim 1, wherein the computer networking connectivity model is UPnP [see Col. 12, Lines 55-61].

Regarding claim 13, Stephens teaches method of providing access to a control point (20) from a media provision entity (12) in a computing environment (10) having a computer networking connectivity model, which entity has at least one logical device (24, 26) providing at least two different sets of permissions in relation to assets (asset1, asset2, asset3, asset4, asset5, asset6) associated with the media provision entity comprising the steps of: receiving an access attempt from a control point in all devices, (step 46), granting access according to one of the sets of permissions for which the control point has received access, (step 48), and allowing access to the assets according to the permissions set, (step 50) [see Figs. 1 & 11 and Abstract and Col. 4, Line 4 to Col. 5, Line 58 and Col. 9, Line 44 to Col. 11, Line 19].

Regarding claim 14, Stephens further teaches Method according to claim 13, wherein the sets provide different permissions on an asset-by-asset basis [see Col. 12, Lines 1-11].

Regarding claim 15, Stephens further teaches method according to claim 13, wherein there are at least two logical devices, where a different set of permissions are associated with each device and the step of allowing access comprises allowing access to the device associated with the set of permissions for which access has been granted [see Fig. 1 and Abstract].

Regarding claim 16, Stephens further teaches method according to claim 13, wherein at least two different sets allow at least one and the same action on an asset, but provide different results [see Col. 12, Lines 1-30].

Claim 17 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 1.

Claim 18 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 2.

Claim 19 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 3.

Claim 20 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 4.

Claim 21 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 5.

Claim 22 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 8.

Regarding claim 23, Stephens further teaches apparatus according to claim 17, wherein a control point has been allowed access according to more than one of the sets of permissions and the apparatus is arranged to allow access based on a logical operation of the access rights of the different sets [see Col. 12, Lines 1-30 and Col. 13, Lines 53-62].

Claim 24 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 10.

Claim 25 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 11.

Claim 26 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 12.

Regarding claim 27, Stephens teaches network of computing apparatuses (10)

using a computer networking connectivity model and comprising: at least one control

point (20) provided in or for one of the apparatuses of the network, an apparatus (12) for

enabling differentiated control point access to services and comprising: at least one

logical device (24, 26) providing at least two different sets of permissions in relation to

assets (asset1, asset2, asset3, asset4, asset5, asset6) associated with the apparatus,

and a security console (22) arranged to: register a control point in or for one of the

logical devices in order to provide access for the control point to at least parts of the

apparatus for rendering services [see Figs. 1 & 11 and Abstract and Col. 4, Line 4 to

Col. 5, Line 58 and Col. 9, Line 44 to Col. 11, Line 19].

Claim 28 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 1.

Claim 29 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 13.

Claim 30 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 1.

Claim 31 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 13.

Other References Cited

4.   The following references cited by the examiner but not relied upon are

considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A) Zintel et al, U.S. Pat. Application Pub. No. US 2002/0035621 A1.

B) Challener et al, U.S. Pat. No. 7,380,268.

C) Shah et al, U.S. Pat. No. 6,243,451.

D) Rogers et al, U.S. Pat. No. 6,956,527.

5.   A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS ACTION IS

SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS

COMMUNICATION. FAILURE TO RESPOND WITHIN THE PERIOD FOR

RESPONSE WILL CAUSE THE APPLICATION TO BECOME ABANDONED (35 U.S.C.

§ 133). EXTENSIONS OF TIME MAY BE OBTAINED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF

37 CAR 1.136(A).

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Philip Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-3991.

The Group fax phone number is (571) 273-8300. If attempts to reach the examiner by

telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar, can be reached on

(571) 272-4006.

7.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Philip B Tran/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2455
June 20, 2009